



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,182	05/31/2007	Lai Albert	PAT051413-US-PCT	7439
75074	7590	03/04/2011	EXAMINER	
NOVARTIS INSTITUTES FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, INC. 220 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139			TSAY, MARSHA M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1656				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/04/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NIBR.MAILDATA@NOVARTIS.COM  
PATRICIA.HOFSTETTER@NOVARTIS.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/574,182	ALBERT, LAI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marsha M. Tsay	1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2010.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 31 and 40 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 31 and 40 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

This Office action is in response to Applicants' remarks received December 2, 2010.

Applicants' arguments have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome some of the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous Office actions are hereby withdrawn.

Claims 1-30, 32-39 are canceled. Claims 31, 40 are currently under examination.

Priority: The request for priority to provisional application 60/507682, filed September 30, 2003, is acknowledged.

## **Objections and Rejections**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 31, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (US 20040086913). Williams et al. disclose nucleic acids that are expressed in human tissue (i.e. human colon) that can comprise a sequence set forth in any one of SEQ ID NOS: 1-316 and further disclose that an "identifying sequence" is a contiguous sequence that can be at least about 10-20 contiguous nucleotides (p. 1 [0011]). Williams et al. further disclose diagnostic assays that involve detecting the expression of nucleotides set forth in any one of SEQ ID NOS: 1-316 (p. 14 [0124-0125]). Williams et al. disclose detecting colon cancer (p. 18 [0156]). Williams et al. disclose a method of detecting a cancer state of a mammalian cell comprising detecting the

expression of an identifying sequence of one of SEQ ID NOS: 1-316, wherein the detection of the differentially expressed identifying sequence is correlated with a cancerous state of the cell from which the test sample was derived (p. 175 claim 11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to detect colon cancer associated with expression of a nucleic acid in a test cell sample comprising detecting a level of expression of at least one identifying sequence which consists of 20 contiguous nucleotides from one of SEQ ID NOS: 1-316 and compare the expression level of the identifying sequence in the test sample with a level of expression of nucleic acid in a normal cell sample where an altered level of expression of said identifying sequence is indicative of colon cancer in the test cell sample, based on the teachings of Kaufman et al. (claims 31, 40). It should be noted that the positions 329-330 of instant SEQ ID NO: 15 and positions 188-189 of instant SEQ ID NO: 25 are the nucleotides “ga” and “gt” respectively. Therefore, an identifying sequence of 20 contiguous nucleotides from one of SEQ ID NOS: 1-316 of Kaufman et al. would include at least the nucleotides “ga” or “gt”.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 31, 40 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 60 of copending Application No. 11887692 ('692). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims and the '692 claim are both drawn to a method for detecting a level of expression of a DKKL1 nucleic acid. The '692 application discloses that the DKKL1 splice product modulator can be at least 10 consecutive nucleotides of a DKKL1 nucleotide sequence and the specification of the '692 application also discloses that said cancer can be colon cancer. The instant claims and the '692 claim both recite the active step of detecting a level of expression of a DKKL1 nucleic acid; therefore, the subject matter of the claims are believed to overlap in scope.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response: Applicants' acknowledgment of the provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over the '692 application is noted; however, the rejection is maintained until the instant claims are in condition for allowance.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marsha M. Tsay whose telephone number is (571)272-2938. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath N. Rao can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha M. Tsay/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1656

February 28, 2011